

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

PENNY RUMSEY, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BIRCH COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
d/b/a LIGHTYEAR WIRELESS, a
Georgia corporation,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:14-cv-12700

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
CLASS CERTIFICATION**

Hon. Gershwin A. Drain

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION

Plaintiff Penny Rumsey (“Rumsey”), through her undersigned counsel, hereby respectfully moves the Court for an Order certifying this case as a class action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2) and (b)(3), but requests that the Court enter and continue the instant motion until after the completion of discovery on class-wide issues, at which time Plaintiff will submit a full memorandum of points and authorities in support of class certification.¹

¹ Plaintiff filed this Motion simultaneously with her Class Action Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial (Dkt. 1) (“Complaint”), to prevent Defendant Birch Communications, Inc. (“Birch Communications”) from attempting a so-called “pick off” to moot her representative claims (*i.e.*, tendering to her the full amount of individual damages alleged in the Complaint). *See Brunet v. City of Columbus*, 1 F.3d 390, 399–400 (6th Cir. 1993) (noting that a “pick off” does not moot the named plaintiff’s claims “where a motion for class certification has been pursued with reasonable diligence and is then pending before the district court.”); *see also*

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

ISSUE PRESENTED

Should this Court enter an order certifying this case as a class action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a), (b)(2), and (b)(3)?

CONTROLLING AUTHORITY

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a), (b)(2), and (b)(3).

I. The Proposed Class

Plaintiff seeks to certify this case as a class action on behalf of a proposed class defined as follows:

All persons in the United States who (1) received a telephone call; (2) promoting an opportunity related to “Lightyear Wireless;” (3) that featured an artificial or pre-recorded voice; and (4) for which the caller had no record of prior express consent to make such call to the telephone number that received it.² (Compl. ¶ 26.)

II. Fed. R Civ. P. 23's Requirements for Certification

In determining whether to certify a class, the Court does not inquire into the

Damasco v. Clearwire Corp., 662 F.3d 891, 896 (7th Cir. 2011) (“Class-action plaintiffs can move to certify the class at the same time that they file their complaint. The pendency of that motion protects a putative class from attempts to buy off the named plaintiffs . . . If the parties have yet to fully develop the facts needed for certification, then they can also ask the district court to delay its ruling to provide time for additional discovery or investigation.”). Due to the fact that Plaintiff has filed this Motion simultaneously with the filing of the Complaint, she was unable to obtain concurrence from Defendant for the relief sought in this Motion pursuant to L.R. 7.1.

² Plaintiff anticipates the potential need to revise the definition of the Class following the conclusion of discovery relating to the class certification issues.

merits of a plaintiff's claims. *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacqueline*, 417 U.S. 156, 177 (1974). Instead, "when evaluating whether to certify the class, the district court must take the allegations of plaintiffs as true, with any doubts resolved in favor of certification." *Yadlosky v. Grant Thornton, L.L.P.*, 197 F.R.D. 292, 295 (E.D. Mich. 2000).

The Court may certify a class when the plaintiff demonstrates that the proposed class and proposed class representatives meet Rule 23(a)'s four prerequisites—numerosity, commonality, typicality, and adequacy of representation—and at least one of the three provisions of Rule 23(b).

As shown below, the Class satisfies each of Rule 23(a)'s prerequisites and the requirements for certification under Rules 23(b)(2) and (b)(3).

A. The Proposed Class Satisfies Rule 23(a)'s Requirements

Rule 23(a)'s first requirement, numerosity, is satisfied where "the class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). To satisfy the numerosity requirement, a plaintiff need only demonstrate that "the number of potential class members is large, even if plaintiffs do not know the exact figure." *In re Consumers Power Co. Sec. Litig.*, 105 F.R.D. 583, 601 (E.D. Mich. 1985); *see Olden v. Lafarge Corp.*, 203 F.R.D. 254, 269 (E.D. Mich. 2001) *aff'd*, 383 F.3d 495 (6th Cir. 2004) ("[W]here the exact size of the class is unknown but general knowledge and common sense indicate that it is large, the numerosity

requirement is satisfied.”); *see Gradisher v. Check Enforcement Unit, Inc.*, 203 F.R.D. 271, 276 (W.D. Mich. 2001) (“[W]hile not an absolute rule, it is generally accepted that a class of 40 or more members is sufficient to establish numerosity.”)

In this case, Plaintiff’s Complaint alleges that Defendant made unsolicited phone calls—specifically automated phone calls (*i.e.*, “robocalls”—to thousands of consumers throughout the country. (Compl. ¶¶ 16, 17, 22, 27); *see Bacon v. Honda of Am. Mfg., Inc.*, 370 F.3d 565, 570 (6th Cir. 2004) (“[The] sheer number of potential litigants in a class, especially if it is more than several hundred, can be the only factor needed to satisfy Rule 23(a)(1).”). The present case therefore satisfies the numerosity requirement, since it affects thousands of consumers in the same way.

The second threshold to certification requires that “there are questions of law or fact common to the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2). Commonality is present where a “common nucleus of operative fact” exists, and a “question of law refers to a standardized conduct of the defendants toward members of the proposed class.” *See Snow v. Atofina Chemicals, Inc.*, 2006 WL 1008002, at *4 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 31, 2006) (“[A] lack of identical factual situations will not necessarily preclude certification where the class representative has shown sufficient common questions of law among the claims of the class members.” quoting *Franklin v. City of Chicago*, 102 F.R.D. 944, 949 (N.D. Ill. 1984)). For commonality to be

demonstrated, “there need be only a single issue common to all members of the class.” *In re Am. Med. Sys., Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1069, 1080 (6th Cir. 1996) (quotation omitted). Generally, the issue of commonality is a relatively low and easily surmountable hurdle. *See Scholes v. Stone, McGuire & Benjamin*, 143 F.R.D. 181, 185 (N.D. Ill. 1992); *see also Jenkins v. Raymark Indus., Inc.*, 782 F.2d 468, 472 (5th Cir. 1986).

As alleged in Plaintiff’s Complaint, all members of the Class share common questions of law and fact that predominate over issues affecting only individual members. (Compl. ¶ 28.) Those common factual and legal issues for the Class include: (1) whether Defendant’s conduct violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“TCPA”); (2) whether Defendant and/or its agents made calls featuring an artificial or pre-recorded voice; (3) whether Defendant and/or its agents systematically made phone calls to persons who did not previously provide Defendant and/or its agents with their prior express consent to receive such phone calls; and (4) whether class members are entitled to treble damages based on the willfulness of Defendant’s conduct. (*Id.*)

Rule 23 next requires that Plaintiff’s claims be typical of those of the Class. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3)*. The typicality requirement determines whether “a sufficient relationship exists between the injury to the named plaintiff and the conduct affecting the class,” and a plaintiff’s claim is typical if it arises “from the

same event or practice or course of conduct that gives rise to the claims of other class members, and if his or her claims are based on the same legal theory.” *In re Am. Med. Sys., Inc.*, 75 F.3d at 1082 (quotation omitted). Nevertheless, the existence of factual distinctions among named and absent class members will not preclude a finding of typicality if there is a “strong similarity of legal theories.” *Int’l Union v. Ford Motor Co.*, 2006 WL 1984363 at *19 (E.D. Mich. July 13, 2006) *aff’d sub nom. Int’l Union, United Auto., Aerospace & Agr. Implement Workers of Am. v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 497 F.3d 615 (6th Cir. 2007).

In this case, Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the absent class members because each claim is based upon identical conduct—Defendant’s uniform practice of making unsolicited telephone calls to Plaintiff and the proposed Class. (Compl. ¶ 29.) Plaintiff’s and the absent Class members’ claims against Defendant are the same. *See id.* Therefore, the typicality element is satisfied.

The final Rule 23(a) prerequisite requires that a proposed class representative “fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). In determining whether the representation of the class is adequate, “the representative must have common interests with unnamed members of the class,” and “it must appear that the representatives will vigorously prosecute the interests of the class through qualified counsel.” *Senter v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 532 F.2d 511, 524–25 (6th Cir. 1976). Courts must also consider: “(a) the work counsel has done

in identifying or investigating potential claims in the action, (b) counsel's experience in handling class actions, other complex litigation, and claims of the type asserted in the action, (c) counsel's knowledge of the applicable law, and (d) the resources counsel will commit to representing the class." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(1)(A); *IUE-CWA v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 238 F.R.D. 583, 592 (E.D. Mich. 2006).

In this case, Plaintiff has the same interests as the proposed Class— obtaining relief from Defendant for the unlawful use of an automated telephone dialing system ("ATDS") to systematically robocall Plaintiff and the members of the Class. (Compl. ¶ 31.) Moreover, Plaintiff's counsel are well respected members of the legal community, have regularly engaged in major complex litigation, and have had extensive experience in consumer class actions involving similar issues and that were of similar size, scope and complexity as the present case. (*See* Firm Resume of Edelson PC, a true and accurate copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1.) Accordingly, both Plaintiff and her counsel will adequately represent the Class.

B. The Proposed Class Satisfies the Requirements of Rules 23(b)(2) and (b)(3)

Once the subsection (a) prerequisites are satisfied, a plaintiff seeking certification under Rule 23(b)(2) or 23(b)(3) must satisfy several additional requirements. Rule 23(b)(2) provides that the party or parties opposing certification must have acted or failed to act on grounds generally applicable to the proposed

class “so that final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief is appropriate. . . .” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2); *Little Caesar Enterprises, Inc. v. Smith*, 172 F.R.D. 236, 268 (E.D. Mich. 1997). Here, there should be no question that Defendant acted on grounds generally applicable to the proposed Class as a whole. Defendant made unsolicited telephone calls to the telephones of consumers nationwide—all without permission—in virtually an identical manner. Thus, Defendant acted and failed to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class as a whole, making final injunctive relief necessary to protect Plaintiff and the Class from such conduct in the future, and satisfying the requirements of Rule 23(b)(2).

Rule 23(b)(3) provides that a class action may be maintained where the questions of law and fact common to members of the proposed class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members. Fed. R. Civ. P 23(b)(3); *In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litig.*, 200 F.R.D. 326, 339 (E.D. Mich. 2001). In this case, common issues of fact and law predominate. Defendant’s unlawful and systematic use of an ATDS to call Plaintiff and members of the proposed Class without their consent, is common to all Class members’ claims and predominates over any issues affecting only individual members. (Compl. ¶ 28.)

Rule 23(b)(3) further requires that the class action mechanism be superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. Fed. R. Civ. P 23(b)(3); *In re Cardizem*, 200 F.R.D. at 339. That requirement is

satisfied here. The injuries suffered by individual Class members are likely to have been relatively small compared to the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the litigation necessitated by Defendant's actions. (Compl. ¶ 32.) Thus, absent a class action, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the individual members of the Class to obtain effective relief. Maintenance of this case as a class action is also superior to other available methods because it would avoid the necessity for multiple adjudications of identical legal and factual issues, thereby reducing the burden on the judiciary. (*Id.*)

For the reasons stated above, and which will be borne out by class discovery, this case is appropriate for class certification. Plaintiff hereby requests that the Court allow for and schedule discovery to take place on class-wide issues, at the conclusion of which, Plaintiff will file a memorandum in support of this motion detailing the appropriateness of class certification and asking the Court to rule on this motion at that time.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Penny Rumsey, individually and on behalf of the proposed Class, respectfully requests that the Court (1) enter and reserve ruling on her Motion for Class Certification, (2) allow for and schedule discovery to take place on class-wide issues, (3) grant her leave to file a memorandum in support of her Motion for Class Certification upon the conclusion of class-wide discovery, (4) grant her Motion for Class Certification after full briefing of the issues presented

herein, and (5) provide all other and further relief that the Court deems equitable and just.

Respectfully submitted,

PENNY RUMSEY, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Dated: July 9, 2014

By: /s/ Ari J. Scharg
One of Plaintiff's Attorneys

Ari J. Scharg
ascharg@edelson.com
John Ochoa*
jochoa@edelson.com
Mark Eisen*
meisen@edelson.com
EDELSON PC
350 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, Illinois 60654
Tel: 312.589.6370
Fax: 312.589.6378

Henry M. Scharg – P28804
hmsattyatlaw@aol.com
LAW OFFICE OF HENRY M. SCHARG
718 Ford Building
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Tel: 248.596.1111
Fax: 248.671.0335

Stefan Coleman*
law@stefancoleman.com
LAW OFFICES OF STEFAN COLEMAN, LLC
201 South Biscayne Boulevard, 28th Floor
Miami, Florida 33131
Tel: 877.333.9427

*Admission to be sought.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Ari J. Scharg, hereby certify that on July 9, 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing paper with the Clerk of the Court using the Court's CM/ECF electronic filing system, and arranged for service of the same by process server at the address listed below:

Birch Communications, Inc.
c/o Corporation Service Company
40 Technology Parkway South, Suite 300
Norcross, Georgia 30092

/s/ Ari J. Scharg _____

EXHIBIT 1

EDELSON PC FIRM RESUME

EDELSON PC is a plaintiff's class action and commercial litigation firm with attorneys in Illinois, Colorado, and California.

Our attorneys have been recognized as leaders in these fields by state and federal legislatures, national and international media groups, the courts, and our peers. Our reputation for leadership in class action litigation has led state and federal courts to appoint us lead counsel in many high-profile class actions, including privacy suits against comScore, Netflix, Time, Microsoft, and Facebook; numerous Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") cases against companies such as Google, Twentieth Century Fox, and Simon & Schuster; class actions against Citibank, Wells Fargo, and JP Morgan Chase related to reductions in home equity lines of credit; fraudulent marketing cases against software companies such as Symantec; mobile content class actions against all major cellular telephone carriers; the Thomas the Tank Engine lead paint class actions; and the tainted pet food litigation. We have testified before the United States Senate on class action issues and have repeatedly been asked to work on federal and state legislation involving cellular telephony, privacy, and other issues. Our attorneys have appeared on dozens of national and international television and radio programs to discuss our cases and class action and consumer protection issues more generally. Our attorneys speak regularly at seminars on consumer protection and class action issues, lecture on class actions at law schools, and are asked to serve as testifying experts in cases involving class action and consumer issues.

PLAINTIFFS' CLASS AND MASS ACTION PRACTICE GROUP

EDELSON PC is a leader in plaintiffs' class and mass action litigation, with a particular emphasis on consumer technology class actions, and has been called a "class action 'super firm.'" (Decalogue Society of Lawyers, Spring 2010.) As recognized by federal courts nationwide, our firm has an "extensive histor[y] of experience in complex class action litigation, and [is a] well-respected law firm[] in the plaintiffs' class action bar." *In re Pet Food Prod. Liab. Litig.*, MDL Dkt. No. 1850, No. 07-2867 (NLH) (D.N.J. Nov. 18, 2008). A leading arbitrator concurred, finding that Edelson was "extraordinarily experienced" in "consumer protection class actions generally," including "technology consumer protection class action[s]."

In appointing our firm interim co-lead in one of the most high profile cases in the country, a federal court pointed to our ability to be "vigorous advocates, constructive problem-solvers, and civil with their adversaries." *In Re JPMorgan Chase Home Equity Line of Credit Litig.*, No. 10 C 3647 (N.D. Ill., July 16, 2010). After hard fought litigation, that case settled, resulting in the reinstatement of between \$3.2 billion and \$4.7 billion in home credit lines.

We have been specifically recognized as "pioneers in the electronic privacy class action field, having litigated some of the largest consumer class actions in the country on this issue." *In re Facebook Privacy Litig.*, No. C 10-02389, Dkt. 69 at 5 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2010) (order appointing the firm interim co-lead of privacy class action); *see also In re Netflix Privacy Litig.*, No. 11-cv-00379, Dkt. 59 at 5 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2011) (appointing us the sole lead counsel due, in part, to our "significant and particularly specialized expertise in electronic privacy litigation and class actions[.]").

Similarly, as recognized by a recent federal court, our firm has “pioneered the application of the TCPA to text-messaging technology, litigating some of the largest consumer class actions in the country on this issue.” *Ellison v Steve Madden, Ltd.*, No. 11-cv-5935 PSG, Dkt. 73 at 9 (C.D. Cal. May 7, 2013).

We have several sub-specialties within our plaintiffs’ class action practice:

PRIVACY/DATA LOSS

Data Loss/Unauthorized Disclosure of Data

We have litigated numerous class actions involving issues of first impression against Facebook, Apple, Netflix, Sony, Redbox, Pandora, Sears, Storm 8, Google, T-Mobile, Microsoft, and others involving failures to protect customers’ private information, security breaches, and unauthorized sharing of personal information with third parties. Representative settlements and ongoing cases include:

- *Dunstan v. comScore, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-5807 (N.D. Ill.): Lead counsel in certified class action accusing internet analytics company of improper data collection practices. The court has preliminarily approved a \$14 million settlement.
- *Resnick v. Avmed*, No. 10-cv-24513 (S.D. Fla.): Lead counsel in data breach case filed against health insurance company. Obtained landmark appellate decision endorsing common law unjust enrichment theory, irrespective of whether identity theft occurred. Case also resulted in the first class action settlement in the country to provide data breach victims with monetary payments irrespective of identity theft.
- *In re Netflix Privacy Litigation*, No. 11-cv-00379 (N.D. Cal.): Sole lead counsel in suit alleging that defendant violated the Video Privacy Protection Act by illegally retaining customer viewing information. Case resulted in a \$9 million dollar *cy pres* settlement that has been finally approved (pending appeal).
- *Halaburda v. Bauer Publishing Co.*, No. 12-cv-12831 (E.D. Mich.); *Grenke v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, No. 12-cv-14221 (E.D. Mich.); *Fox v. Time, Inc.*, No. 12-cv-14390 (E.D. Mich.): Consolidated actions brought under Michigan’s Video Rental Privacy Act, alleging unlawful disclosure of subscribers’ personal information. In a ground-breaking decision, the court denied three motions to dismiss finding that the magazine publishers were covered by the act and that the illegal sale of personal information triggers an automatic \$5,000 award to each aggrieved consumer.
- *Standiford v. Palm*, No. 09-cv-05719-LHK (N.D. Cal.): Sole lead counsel in data loss class action, resulting in \$640,000 settlement.

- *In re Zynga Privacy Litigation*, No. 10-cv-04680 (N.D. Cal.): Appointed co-lead counsel in suit against gaming application designer for the alleged unlawful disclosure of its users' personally identifiable information to advertisers and other third parties.
- *In re Facebook Privacy Litigation*, No. 10-cv-02389 (N.D. Cal.): Appointed co-lead counsel in suit alleging that Facebook unlawfully shared its users' sensitive personally identifiable information with Facebook's advertising partners.
- *In re Sidekick Litigation*, No. C 09-04854-JW (N.D. Cal.): Co-lead counsel in cloud computing data loss case against T-Mobile and Microsoft. Settlement provided the class with potential settlement benefits valued at over \$12 million.
- *Desantis v. Sears*, No. 08 CH 00448 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Lead counsel in injunctive settlement alleging national retailer allowed purchase information to be publicly available through the internet.

Telephone Consumer Protection Act

Edelson has been at the forefront of TCPA litigation for over six years, having secured the groundbreaking *Satterfield* ruling in the Ninth Circuit applying the TCPA to text messages. *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.*, 569 F.3d 946 (9th Cir. 2009). In addition to numerous settlements totaling over \$100 million in relief to consumers, we have over two dozen putative TCPA class actions pending against companies including Santander Consumer USA, Inc., Walgreen Co., Path, Inc., Nuance Communications, Inc., Stonebridge Life Insurance, Inc., GEICO, DirectBuy, Inc., and RCI, Inc. Representative settlements and ongoing cases include:

- *Rojas v CEC*, No. 10-cv-05260 (N.D. Ill.): Lead counsel in text spam class action that settled for \$19,999,400.
- *In re Jiffy Lube Int'l Text Spam Litigation*, No. 11-md-2261, 2012 WL 762888 (S.D. Cal.): Co-lead counsel in \$35 million text spam settlement.
- *Ellison v Steve Madden, Ltd.*, No. cv 11-5935 PSG (C.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in \$10 million text spam settlement.
- *Kramer v. B2Mobile*, No. 0-cv-02722-CW (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in \$12.2 million text spam settlement.
- *Pimental v. Google, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-02585 (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in class action alleging that defendant co-opted group text messaging lists to send unsolicited text messages. \$6 million settlement provides class members with an unprecedented \$500 recovery.

- *Robles v. Lucky Brand Dungarees, Inc.*, No. 10-cv-04846 (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in \$10 million text spam settlement.
- *Miller v. Red Bull*, No. 12-CV-04961 (N.D. Ill.): Lead counsel in \$6 million text spam settlement.
- *Woodman v. ADP Dealer Services*, No. 2013 CH 10169 (Cook County, IL): Lead counsel in \$7.5 million text spam settlement.
- *Lozano v. 20th Century Fox*, No. 09-cv-05344 (N.D. Ill.): Lead counsel in class action alleging that defendants violated federal law by sending unsolicited text messages to cellular telephones of consumers. Case settled for \$16 million.
- *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster*, No. C 06 2893 CW (N.D. Cal.): Co-lead counsel in \$10 million text spam settlement.
- *Weinstein v. Airit2me, Inc.*, No. 06 C 0484 (N.D. Ill.): Co-lead counsel in \$7 million text spam settlement.

CONSUMER TECHNOLOGY

Fraudulent Software

In addition to the settlements listed below, EDELSON PC has consumer fraud cases pending in courts nationwide against companies such as McAfee, Inc., Avanquest North America Inc., PC Cleaner, AVG, iolo Technologies, LLC, among others. Representative settlements include:

- *Drymon v. Cyberdefender*, No. 11 CH 16779 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Lead counsel in class action alleging that defendant deceptively designed and marketed its computer repair software. Case settled for \$9.75 million.
- *Gross v. Symantec Corp.*, No. 12-cv-00154-CRB (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in class action alleging that defendant deceptively designed and marketed its computer repair software. Case settled for \$11 million.
- *LaGarde v. Support.com, Inc.*, No. 12-cv-00609-JSC (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in class action alleging that defendant deceptively designed and marketed its computer repair software. Case settled for \$8.59 million.
- *Ledet v. Ascentive LLC*, No. 11-CV-294-PBT (E.D. Pa.): Lead counsel in class action alleging that defendant deceptively designed and marketed its computer repair software. Case settled for \$9.6 million.

- *Webb v. Cleverbridge, Inc.*, No. 1:11-cv-04141 (N.D. Ill.): Lead counsel in class action alleging that defendant deceptively designed and marketed its computer repair software. Case settled for \$5.5 million.

Video Games

EDELSON PC has litigated cases video-game related cases against Activision Blizzard Inc., Electronic Arts, Inc., Google, and Zenimax Media, Inc., and has active litigation pending, including:

- *Locke v. Sega of America*, No. 13-cv-01962-MEJ (N.D. Cal.): Pending putative class action alleging that Sega of America and Gearbox Software released video game trailer that falsely represented the actual content of the game.

MORTGAGE & BANKING

EDELSON PC has been at the forefront of class action litigation arising in the aftermath of the federal bailouts of the banks. Our suits include claims that certain banks unlawfully suspended home credit lines based on pre-textual reasons, and that certain banks have failed to honor loan modification programs. We achieved the first federal appellate decision in the country recognizing the right of borrowers to enforce HAMP trial plans under state law. The court noted that “[p]rompt resolution of this matter is necessary not only for the good of the litigants but for the good of the Country.” *Wigod v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 673 F.3d 547, 586 (7th Cir. 2012) (Ripple, J., concurring). Our settlements have restored billions of dollars in home credit lines to people throughout the country. Representative cases and settlements include:

- *In re JP Morgan Chase Bank Home Equity Line of Credit Litigation*, No. 10-cv-3647 (N.D. Ill.): Court appointed interim co-lead counsel in nationwide putative class action alleging illegal suspensions of home credit lines. Settlement restored between \$3.2 billion and \$4.7 billion in credit to the class.
- *Hamilton v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 09-cv-04152-CW (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in class actions challenging Wells Fargo’s suspensions of home equity lines of credit. Nationwide settlement restores access to over \$1 billion in credit and provides industry leading service enhancements and injunctive relief.
- *In re Citibank HELOC Reduction Litigation*, No. 09-cv-0350-MMC (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in class actions challenging Citibank’s suspensions of home equity lines of credit. The settlement restored up to \$653,920,000 worth of credit to affected borrowers.

- *Wigod v. Wells Fargo*, No. 10-cv-2348 (N.D. Ill.): In ongoing putative class action, obtained first appellate decision in the country recognizing the right of private litigants to sue to enforce HAMP trial plans.

GENERAL CONSUMER PROTECTION CLASS ACTIONS

We have successfully prosecuted countless class actions against computer software companies, technology companies, health clubs, dating agencies, phone companies, debt collectors, and other businesses on behalf of consumers. In addition to the settlements listed below, EDELSON PC have litigated consumer fraud cases in courts nationwide against companies such as Motorola Mobility, Stonebridge Benefit Services, J.C. Penney, Sempris LLC, and Plimus, LLC. Representative settlements include:

Mobile Content

We have prosecuted over 100 cases involving mobile content, settling numerous nationwide class actions, including against industry leader AT&T Mobility, collectively worth over a hundred million dollars.

- *McFerren v. AT&T Mobility, LLC*, No. 08-CV-151322 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct., Ga.): Lead counsel class action settlement involving 16 related cases against largest wireless service provider in the nation. “No cap” settlement provided virtually full refunds to a nationwide class of consumers who alleged that unauthorized charges for mobile content were placed on their cell phone bills.
- *Paluzzi v. Cellco Partnership*, No. 07 CH 37213 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Lead counsel in class action settlement involving 27 related cases alleging unauthorized mobile content charges. Case settled for \$36 million.
- *Gray v. Mobile Messenger Americas, Inc.*, No. 08-CV-61089 (S.D. Fla.): Lead counsel in case alleging unauthorized charges were placed on cell phone bills. Case settled for \$12 million.
- *Parone v. m-Qube, Inc.*, No. 08 CH 15834 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Lead counsel in class action settlement involving over 2 dozen cases alleging the imposition of unauthorized mobile content charges. Case settled for \$12.254 million.
- *Williams v. Motricity, Inc.*, No. 09 CH 19089 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Lead counsel in class action settlement involving 24 cases alleging the imposition of unauthorized mobile content charges. Case settled for \$9 million.

- *VanDyke v. Media Breakaway, LLC*, No. 08 CV 22131 (S.D. Fla.): Lead counsel in class action settlement alleging unauthorized mobile content charges. Case settled for \$7.6 million.
- *Gresham v. Cellco Partnership*, No. BC 387729 (L.A. Super. Ct., Cal.): Lead counsel in case alleging unauthorized charges were placed on cell phone bills. Settlement provided class members with full refunds.
- *Abrams v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. 07-05378 (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in injunctive settlement concerning the transmission of allegedly unauthorized mobile content.

Deceptive Marketing

- *Van Tassell v. UMG*, No. 1:10-cv-2675 (N.D. Ill.): Lead counsel in negative option marketing class action. Case settled for \$2.85 million.
- *McK Sales Inc. v. Discover Bank*, No. 10-cv-02964 (N.D. Ill.): Lead counsel in class action alleging deceptive marketing aimed at small businesses. Case settled for \$6 million.
- *Farrell v. OpenTable*, No 11-cv-01785-si (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in gift certificate expiration case. Settlement netted class over \$3 million in benefits.
- *Ducharme v. Lexington Law*, No. 10-cv-2763-crb (N.D. Cal.): Lead counsel in CROA class action. Settlement resulted in over \$6 million of benefits to the class.
- *Pulcini v. Bally Total Fitness Corp.*, No. 05 CH 10649 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Co-lead counsel in four class action lawsuits brought against two health clubs and three debt collection companies. A global settlement provided the class with over \$40 million in benefits, including cash payments, debt relief, and free health club services.
- *Kozubik v. Capital Fitness, Inc.*, 04 CH 627 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Co-lead counsel in state-wide suit against a leading health club chain, which settled in 2004, providing the over 150,000 class members with between \$11 million and \$14 million in benefits, consisting of cash refunds, full debt relief, and months of free health club membership.
- *Kim v. Riscuity*, No. 06 C 01585 (N.D. Ill.): Co-lead counsel in suit against a debt collection company accused of attempting to collect on illegal contracts. The case settled in 2007, providing the class with full debt relief and return of all money collected.

- *Jones v. TrueLogic Financial Corp.*, No. 05 C 5937 (N.D. Ill.): Co-lead counsel in suit against two debt collectors accused of attempting to collect on illegal contracts. The case settled in 2007, providing the class with approximately \$2 million in debt relief.
- *Fertelmeyster v. Match.com*, No. 02 CH 11534 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Co-lead counsel in a state-wide class action suit brought under Illinois consumer protection statutes. The settlement provided the class with a collective award with a face value in excess of \$3 million.
- *Cioe v. Yahoo!, Inc.*, No. 02 CH 21458 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Co-lead counsel in a state-wide class action suit brought under state consumer protection statutes. The settlement provided the class with a collective award with a face value between \$1.6 million and \$4.8 million.
- *Zurakov v. Register.com*, No. 01-600703 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cnty.): Co-lead counsel in a class action brought on behalf of an international class of over one million members against Register.com for its allegedly deceptive practices in advertising on “coming soon” pages of newly registered Internet domain names. Settlement required Register.com to fully disclose its practices and provided the class with relief valued in excess of \$17 million.

PRODUCTS LIABILITY CLASS ACTIONS

We have been appointed lead counsel in state and federal products liability class settlements, including a \$30 million settlement resolving the “Thomas the Tank Engine” lead paint recall cases and a \$32 million settlement involving the largest pet food recall in the history of the United States and Canada. Representative settlements include:

- *Barrett v. RC2 Corp.*, No. 07 CH 20924 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Co-lead counsel in lead paint recall case involving Thomas the Tank toy trains. Settlement is valued at over \$30 million and provided class with full cash refunds and reimbursement of certain costs related to blood testing.
- *In re Pet Food Products Liability Litigation*, No. 07-2867 (D.N.J.): Part of mediation team in class action involving largest pet food recall in United States history. Settlement provided \$24 million common fund and \$8 million in charge backs.

INSURANCE CLASS ACTIONS

We have prosecuted and settled multi-million dollar suits against J.C. Penney Life Insurance for allegedly illegally denying life insurance benefits under an unenforceable policy exclusion and against a Wisconsin insurance company for terminating the health insurance policies of groups of self-insureds. Representative settlements include:

- *Holloway v. J.C. Penney*, No. 97 C 4555, (N.D. Ill.): One of the primary attorneys in a multi-state class action suit alleging that the defendant illegally denied life insurance benefits to the class. The case settled in or around December of 2000, resulting in a multi-million dollar cash award to the class.
- *Ramlow v. Family Health Plan* (Wisc. Cir. Ct., WI): Co-lead counsel in a class action suit challenging defendant's termination of health insurance to groups of self-insureds. The plaintiff won a temporary injunction, which was sustained on appeal, prohibiting such termination and eventually settled the case ensuring that each class member would remain insured.

MASS/CLASS TORT CASES

Our attorneys were part of a team of lawyers representing a group of public housing residents in a suit based upon contamination related injuries, a group of employees exposed to second-hand smoke on a riverboat casino, and a class of individuals suing a hospital and national association of blood banks for failure to warn of risks related to blood transfusions. Representative settlements include:

- *Aaron v. Chicago Housing Authority*, No. 99 L 11738, (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.): Part of team representing a group of public housing residents bringing suit over contamination-related injuries. Case settled on a mass basis for over \$10 million.
- *Januszewski v. Horseshoe Hammond*, No. 2:00CV352JM (N.D. Ind.): Part of team of attorneys in mass suit alleging that defendant riverboat casino caused injuries to its employees arising from exposure to second-hand smoke.

The firm's cases regularly receive attention from local, national, and international media. Our cases and attorneys have been reported in the Chicago Tribune, USA Today, the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, the LA Times, by the Reuters and UPI news services, and BBC International. Our attorneys have appeared on numerous national television and radio programs, including ABC World News, CNN, Fox News, NPR, and CBS Radio, as well as television and radio programs outside of the United States. We have also been called upon to give congressional testimony and other assistance in hearings involving our cases.

GENERAL COMMERCIAL LITIGATION

Our attorneys have handled a wide range of general commercial litigation matters, from partnership and business-to-business disputes, to litigation involving corporate takeovers. We have handled cases involving tens of thousands of dollars to "bet the company" cases involving up to hundreds of millions of dollars. Our attorneys have collectively tried hundreds of cases, as well as scores of arbitrations and mediations.

OUR ATTORNEYS

JAY EDELSON is the founder and Managing Partner of EDELSON PC. He has been recognized as a leader in class actions, technology law, corporate compliance issues, and consumer advocacy by his peers, the media, state and federal legislators, academia, and courts throughout the country.

Jay has been appointed lead counsel in numerous state, federal, and international class actions, resulting in hundreds of millions of dollars for his clients. He is regularly asked to weigh in on federal and state legislation involving his cases. He testified to the U.S. Senate about the largest pet food recall in the country's history and is advising state and federal politicians on consumer issues relating to the recent federal bailouts, as well as technology issues, such as those involving mobile marketing. Jay also counsels companies on legal compliance and legislative issues in addition to handling all types of complex commercial litigation.

Jay has litigated class actions that have established precedent concerning the ownership rights of domain name registrants, the applicability of consumer protection statutes to Internet businesses, and the interpretation of numerous other state and federal statutes including the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and the Video Privacy Protection Act. As lead counsel, he has also secured settlement in cases of first impression involving Facebook, Microsoft, AT&T, and countless others, collectively worth hundreds of millions of dollars.

In addition to technology based litigation, Jay has been involved in a number of high-profile "mass tort" class actions and product recall cases, including cases against Menu Foods for selling contaminated pet food, a \$30 million class action settlement involving the Thomas the Tank Engine toy train recall, and suits involving damages arising from second-hand smoke.

In 2009, Jay was named one of the top 40 Illinois attorneys under 40 by the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin. In giving Jay that award, he was heralded for his history of bringing and winning landmark cases and for his "reputation for integrity" in the "rough and tumble class action arena." In the same award, he was called "one of the best in the country" when it "comes to legal strategy and execution." Also in 2009, Jay was included in the American Bar Association's "24 hours of Legal Rebels" program, where he was dubbed one of "the most creative minds in the legal profession" for his views of associate training and firm management. In 2010, he was presented with the Annual Humanitarian Award in recognition of his "personal integrity, professional achievements, and charitable contributions" by the Hope Presbyterian Church. Starting in 2011, he has been selected as an Illinois Super Lawyer and, separately, as a top Illinois class action lawyer by Benchmark Plaintiff.

Jay is frequently asked to participate in legal seminars and discussions regarding the cases he is prosecuting, including serving as panelist on national symposium on tort reform and, separately, serving as a panelist on litigating high-profile cases. He has also appeared on dozens of television and radio programs to discuss his cases. He has taught classes on class action law at Northwestern Law School and The John Marshall Law School, and has co-chaired a 2-day national symposium on class action issues. He has been an adjunct professor, teaching a seminar on class action litigation at Chicago-Kent College of Law since 2010.

Jay is a graduate of Brandeis University and the University of Michigan Law School.

RYAN D. ANDREWS is a Partner at EDELSON PC, and the Chair of the Telecommunications Practice Group. Ryan has been appointed class counsel in numerous state and federal class actions nationwide that have resulted in nearly \$100 million dollars in refunds to consumers, including *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.*, No. C 06 2893 CW (N.D. Cal.); *Gray v. Mobile Messenger Americas, Inc.*, No. 08-CV-61089 (S.D. Fla.); *Lofton v. Bank of America Corp.*, No. 07-5892 (N.D. Cal.); *Paluzzi v. Cellco Partnership*, No. 07 CH 37213 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.), *Parone v. m-Qube, Inc.* No. 08 CH 15834 (Cook County, Ill.); and *Kramer v. Autobytel, Inc.*, No. 10-cv-2722 (N.D. Cal. 2010).

In addition, Ryan has achieved groundbreaking court decisions protecting consumers through the application of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act to emerging text-messaging technology. Representative reported decisions include: *Lozano v. Twentieth Century Fox*, 702 F. Supp. 2d 999 (N.D. Ill. 2010); *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.* 569 F.3d 946 (9th Cir. 2009); *Kramer v. Autobytel, Inc.*, 759 F. Supp. 2d 1165 (N.D. Cal. 2010); *In re Jiffy Lube Int'l Text Spam Litig.*, No. 11-md-2261, 2012 WL 762888 (S.D. Cal. March 9, 2012).

Ryan received his J.D. with High Honors from the Chicago-Kent College of Law and was named Order of the Coif. Recently, Ryan has returned to Chicago-Kent as an Adjunct Professor of Law, teaching a third-year seminar on Class Actions. While in law school, Ryan was a Notes & Comments Editor for The Chicago-Kent Law Review, as well as a teaching assistant for both Property Law and Legal Writing courses. Ryan externed for the Honorable Joan B. Gottschall in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

A native of the Detroit area, Ryan graduated from the University of Michigan, earning his B.A., with distinction, in Political Science and Communications.

Ryan is licensed to practice in Illinois state courts, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

RAFEY S. BALABANIAN is a Partner and the Chair of the Corporate Governance and Business Litigation Practice Group. Rafev's practice focuses upon a wide range of complex consumer class action litigation, as well as general business litigation.

On the plaintiff's side, Rafev has been appointed lead counsel in numerous class actions, including landmark settlements involving the telecom industry worth hundreds of millions of dollars. Rafev has been appointed Class Counsel in nationwide class action settlements against the major wireless carriers, aggregators, and providers of "mobile content," including *Van Dyke v. Media Breakaway, LLC*, No. 08-cv-22131 (S.D. Fla.); *Parone v. m-Qube, Inc.*, No. 08 CH 15834 (Cir. Ct. Cook County, Ill.); *Williams v. Motricity, Inc.*, et al., No. 09 CH 19089 (Cir. Ct. Cook County, Ill.); and *Walker v. OpenMarket, Inc.*, et al., No. 08 CH 40592 (Cir. Ct. Cook County, Ill.).

On the business side, Rafev has counseled clients ranging from "emerging technology" companies, real estate developers, hotels, insurance companies, lenders, shareholders and

attorneys. He has successfully litigated numerous multi-million dollar cases, including several “bet the company” cases.

Rafey has first chaired jury and bench trials, mediations, and national and international arbitrations.

Rafey received his J.D. from the DePaul University College of Law in 2005. While in law school, he received a certificate in international and comparative law. Rafey received his B.A. in History, with distinction, from the University of Colorado – Boulder in 2002.

CHRISTOPHER L. DORE is a Partner at Edelson and a member of the Technology and Fraudulent Marketing Group. Chris focuses his practice on emerging consumer technology issues, with his cases relating to online fraud, deceptive marketing, consumer privacy, negative option membership enrollment, and unsolicited text messaging. Chris is also a member of the firm’s Incubation and Startup Development Group wherein he consults with emergent businesses.

Chris has been appointed class counsel in multiple class actions, including one of the largest text-spam settlements under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, groundbreaking issues in the mobile phone industry and fraudulent marketing, as well as consumer privacy. *See Pimental v. Google, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-02585 (N.D. Cal.); *Turner v. Storm8, LLC*, No. 09-cv-05234 (N.D. Cal.); *Standiford v Palm, Inc.*, No. 09-cv-05719-LHK (N.D. Cal.); and *Espinal v Burger King Corporation*, No. 09-cv-20982 (S.D. Fla.). In addition, Chris has achieved groundbreaking court decisions protecting consumer rights. Representative reported decisions include: *Claridge v. RockYou, Inc.*, 785 F. Supp. 2d 855 (N.D. Cal. 2011); *Kramer v. Autobytel, Inc.*, 759 F. Supp. 2d 1165 (N.D. Cal. 2010); and *Van Tassell v. United Marketing Group, LLC*, 795 F. Supp. 2d 770 (N.D. Ill. 2011). In total, his suits have resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars to consumers.

Prior to joining Edelson, Chris worked for two large defense firms in the areas of employment and products liability. Chris graduated *magna cum laude* from The John Marshall Law School, where he served as the Executive Lead Articles for the Law Review, as well as a team member for the D.M. Harish International Moot Court Competition in Mumbai, India. Chris has since returned to his alma mater to lecture on current issues in class action litigation and negotiations.

Before entering law school, Chris received his Masters degree in Legal Sociology, graduating *magna cum laude* from the International Institute for the Sociology of Law, located in Onati, Spain. Chris received his B.A. in Legal Sociology from the University of California, Santa Barbara.

BENJAMIN H. RICHMAN is a Partner at EDELSON PC and is a member of the firm’s Corporate Governance and Business Litigation Practice Group. He handles plaintiff’s-side consumer class actions, focusing mainly on technology-related cases, represents corporate defendants in class actions, and handles general commercial litigation matters.

On the plaintiff’s side, Ben has brought industry-changing lawsuits involving the marketing practices of the mobile industry, print and online direct advertisers, and Internet companies. He has successfully prosecuted cases involving privacy claims and the negligent storage of consumer data. His suits have also uncovered complex fraudulent methodologies of Web 2.0

companies, including the use of automated bots to distort the value of consumer goods and services. In total, his suits have resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars to consumers.

On the defense side, Ben has represented large institutional lenders in the defense of employment class actions. He also routinely represents technology companies in a wide variety of both class action defense and general commercial litigation matters.

Ben received his J.D. from The John Marshall Law School, where he was an Executive Editor of the Law Review and earned a Certificate in Trial Advocacy. While in law school, Ben served as a judicial extern to the Honorable John W. Darrah of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, in addition to acting as a teaching assistant for Prof. Rogelio Lasso in several torts courses. Ben has since returned to the classroom as a guest-lecturer on issues related to class actions, complex litigation and negotiation. He also lectures incoming law students on the core first year curriculums. Before entering law school, Ben graduated from Colorado State University with a B.S. in Psychology.

Ben is the director of EDELSON PC's Summer Associate Program.

ARI J. SCHARG is a Partner at EDELSON PC. He handles technology-related class actions, focusing mainly on cases involving the unlawful geo-locational tracking of consumers through their mobile devices, the illegal collection, storage, and disclosure of personal information, fraudulent software products, data breaches, and text message spam. His settlements have resulted in tens of millions of dollars to consumers, as well as industry-changing injunctive relief. Ari has been appointed class counsel by state and federal courts in several nationwide class action settlements, including *Webb v. Cleverbridge*, No. 11-cv-4141 (N.D. Ill.); *Ledet v. Ascentive*, No. 11-cv-294 (E.D. Penn.); and *Drymon v. CyberDefender*, No. 11 CH 16779 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.); and was appointed sole-lead class counsel in *Loewy v. Live Nation*, No. 11-cv-4872 (N.D. Ill.), where the court praised his work as "impressive" and noted that he "understand[s] what it means to be on a team that's working toward justice." Ari was selected as an Illinois Rising Star (2013) by Super Lawyers.

Prior to joining the firm, Ari worked as a litigation associate at a large Chicago firm, where he represented a wide range of clients including Fortune 500 companies and local municipalities. His work included representing the Cook County Sheriff's Office in several civil rights cases and he was part of the litigation team that forced Craigslist to remove its "Adult Services" section from its website.

Ari is very active in community groups and legal industry associations. He is a member of the Board of Directors of the Chicago Legal Clinic, an organization that provides legal services to low-income families in the Chicago area. Ari acts as Outreach Chair of the Young Adult Division of American Committee for the Shaare Zedek Medical Center in Jerusalem, and is actively involved with the Anti-Defamation League. He is also a member of the Standard Club Associates Committee.

Ari received his B.A. in Sociology from the University of Michigan – Ann Arbor and graduated magna cum laude from The John Marshall Law School where he served as a Staff Editor for The John Marshall Law Review and competed nationally in trial competitions. During law school, he

also served as a judicial extern to The Honorable Bruce W. Black of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

STEVEN LEZELL WOODROW is a Partner and Chair of the firm's Banking and Financial Services Practice Group. Steven focuses his practice on complex national class actions against some of the Country's largest financial institutions. Representative matters include cases against national banks and mortgage servicers for improper loan modification practices, unlawful home equity line of credit ("HELOC") account suspensions and reductions, and claims regarding the misapplication of payments.

Steven delivered the winning oral argument in *Wigod v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 673 F.3d 547 (7th Cir. 2012), the first federal appellate court decision to allow borrowers to challenge bank failures to follow the federal Home Affordable Modification Program ("HAMP") under state law.

Courts have also appointed Steven as class counsel in nationwide class action settlements against cellphone companies, aggregators, and mobile content providers related to unauthorized charges for ringtones and other mobile content, including *Paluzzi v. Celco Partnership*, No. 08-cv-00405 (N.D. Ill.); *Williams v. Motricity, Inc.*, No. 09 CH 19809 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.); and *Walker v. OpenMarket Inc.*, No. 08 CH 40592 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.).

Steven has also served as an Adjunct Professor of Law at Chicago-Kent College of Law where he co-taught a seminar on class actions. Prior to joining the firm, he worked as a litigator at a Chicago boutique where he tried and arbitrated a range of consumer protection and real estate matters.

Steven received his J.D. High Honors, Order of the Coif, from Chicago-Kent College of Law in 2005. During law school, Mr. Woodrow served as a Notes and Comments Editor for The Chicago-Kent Law Review, competed on Moot Court, and served as President of the Student Bar Association. He additionally spent a semester as a judicial extern for the Honorable Ann C. Williams on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Steven received the ALI-ABA Scholarship and Leadership Award for best representing the combination of leadership and scholarship in his graduating class as well as the Lowell H. Jacobson Memorial Scholarship, which is awarded competitively each year to a student from one of the law schools in the Seventh Circuit to recognize personal commitment and achievement.

Steven is admitted to practice in Colorado (2011) and Illinois (2005).

Steven received his B.A. in Political Science with Distinction from the University of Michigan—Ann Arbor in 2002.

COURTNEY BOOTH is an Associate at EDELSON PC. Courtney focuses her practice on consumer class actions.

Courtney received her J.D., *magna cum laude*, from The John Marshall Law School. While in law school, she was a staff editor of The John Marshall Law Review, a teaching assistant for Legal Writing and Civil Procedure, and a member of the Moot Court Honor Society. Courtney represented John Marshall at the Mercer Legal Ethics and Professionalism Competition where

she was a semi-finalist and won Best Respondent's Brief and at the Cardozo/BMI Entertainment and Communications Law Competition where she placed in the top three oralists. Courtney was recently nominated as a 2013 Member of the National Order of Scribes.

Prior to law school, Courtney attended Saint Louis University where she earned a B.A. in Communication. While there, she was a community relations intern for the St. Louis Blues.

MARK EISEN is an Associate at EDELSON PC, where he focuses on consumer class actions. Prior to joining the firm, Mark clerked for the Honorable Gary Allen Feess, United States District Court for the Central District of California.

Mark received his J.D., *magna cum laude*, from the Boston University School of Law. While in law school, he won the Homer Albers Prize Moot Court Competition, represented BU on the National Moot Court team, and was a note development editor on the BU International Law Journal. Mark's academic note, *Who's Running This Place? A Comparative Look at the Political Appointment System in the United States and Britain, and What the United States Can Learn*, was published in the International Law Journal in the spring of 2012. Most importantly, Mark was active with the Boston University School of Law Softball Team.

Prior to law school, Mark attended the University of Southern California where he earned a B.A., *magna cum laude*, in Political Science and Economics. While there, Mark was a teaching assistant to Professor Dan Schnur. Mark also traveled the country as part of the advance team for John McCain's 2008 presidential campaign.

CHANDLER GIVENS is an Associate at EDELSON PC, where his practice focuses on technology and privacy class actions. His lawsuits have centered on fraudulent software development, unlawful tracking of consumers through mobile devices and computers, illegal data retention, and data breach litigation.

Chandler leads a group of researchers in investigating complex technological fraud and privacy related violations. His team's research has lead to cases that have helped cause significant reforms to the utility software industry and resulted in tens of millions of dollars to U.S. consumers. On the privacy litigation front, Chandler plays an instrumental role in applying new technologies to federal and state statutes. His briefing of these issues has helped produce seminal rulings under statutes like the Stored Communications Act and establish data breach jurisprudence favorable to consumers.

A frequent speaker on emerging law and technology issues, Chandler has presented to legal panels and state bar associations on topics ranging from data privacy and security to complex litigation and social media. He has been featured on syndicated radio, quoted in major publications such as Reuters and PCWorld, and been an invited cyberlaw guest lecturer at his alma mater.

Chandler graduated from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law where he was a research assistant for Cyberlaw Professor Dr. Kevin Ashley, and a judicial extern for the Honorable David S. Cercone of the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. He graduated cum laude from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, with a B.S. in

business information technology, with a focus on computer-based decision support systems. Chandler sits on the ABA committees for Information Security and e-Discovery.

Before joining the legal profession, Chandler worked as a systems analyst. He has also interned at the Virginia Attorney General's Office as well as the U.S. Department of Justice in Washington, D.C.

ALICIA HWANG is an Associate at EDELSON PC. Alicia practices in the area of consumer class action and general litigation.

Alicia received her J.D. from the Northwestern University School of Law in May 2012, where she was an articles editor for the Journal of Law and Social Policy. During law school, Alicia was a legal intern for the Chinese American Service League, served as president of the Asian Pacific American Law Student Association and the Student Animal Legal Defense Fund, and was Chair of the Student Services Committee. She also worked as a student in the Northwestern Entrepreneurship Law Clinic and Complex Civil Litigation and Investor Protection Clinic.

Prior to joining EDELSON PC, Alicia worked as an Executive Team Leader for the Target Corporation, as well as a public relations intern for a tourism-marketing agency in London.

Alicia graduated *magna cum laude* from the University of Southern California, earning her B.A. in Communication in 2007. She is a member of the Phi Beta Kappa honor society.

NICK LARRY is an Associate at EDELSON PC. Nick practices in the area of consumer class action and general litigation.

Nick received his J.D., *cum laude*, from Northwestern University School of Law, where he was a senior editor of the Northwestern University Journal of International Law and Business.

Nick attended Michigan State University, where he graduated with a B.A. in General Business Administration/Pre-law in 2008 and played on the school's rugby team.

MEGAN LINDSEY is an Associate at EDELSON PC. Megan practices in the area of consumer class action, focusing on complex class actions in the banking industry.

Prior to joining EDELSON PC, Megan worked for several years as a commercial loan underwriter and portfolio officer at Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith. Megan also worked as an analyst in the troubled asset group at Bank of America, helping to monitor and restructure high-risk loans.

Megan received her J.D. from Chicago-Kent College of Law in May 2011. During law school Megan externed for the Honorable William Bauer in the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and served as Vice President-Evening Division of the Student Bar Association and Vice President of the Moot Court Honor Society. Megan also represented Chicago-Kent at the National First Amendment Moot Court Competition in Nashville, Tennessee and the National Cultural Heritage Law Moot Court Competition in Chicago, Illinois.

Megan graduated with High Honors from DePaul University in July 2005, earning her B.S. in Finance.

DAVID I. MINDELL is an Associate at EDELSON PC. David practices in the area of technology and privacy class actions.

David has worked on cases involving fraudulent software products, unlawful collection and retention of consumer data, and mobile-device privacy violations. David also serves as a business consultant to private companies at all stages of development, from start-up to exit.

Prior to joining EDELSON PC, David co-founded several technology companies that reached multi-million dollar valuations within 12 months of launch. David has advised or created strategic development and exit plans for a variety of other technology companies.

While in law school, David was a research assistant for University of Chicago Law School Kauffman and Bigelow Fellow, Matthew Tokson, and for the preeminent cyber-security professor, Hank Perritt at the Chicago-Kent College of Law. David's research included cyberattack and denial of service vulnerabilities of the Internet, intellectual property rights, and privacy issues.

David has given speeches related to his research to a wide-range of audiences.

AMIR MISSAGHI is an Associate at Edelson, where he focuses on technology and privacy class actions.

Amir received his J.D. from the Chicago-Kent College of Law, where he was a member of the Moot Court Honor Society and a teaching assistant in Property. Before law school, he attended the University of Minnesota, where he received his B.S. in Applied Economics. He then began working at a Fortune 50 company as a programmer and data analyst. During that time Amir started working on his graduate studies in Applied Economics where he focused on analyzing consumer choice in healthcare markets.

JOHN OCHOA is an associate at EDELSON PC, focusing his practice on protecting consumers with a special emphasis on plaintiffs' privacy class action litigation, including cases brought under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. John prosecutes cases in both state and federal courts at the trial and appellate levels.

John has secured important court decisions protecting the rights of consumers, including *Elder v. Pacific Bell Telephone Co*, 205 Cal. App. 4th 841 (2012), where the California Court of Appeal held that consumers may pursue claims against telecommunications companies for placing unauthorized charges on consumers' telephone bills, a practice known as "cramming." John was also appointed class counsel in *Lee v. Stonebridge Life Insurance Co*, 289 F.R.D. 292 (N.D. Cal. 2013), a case where the defendants are alleged to have caused the transmission of unauthorized text messages to the cellular telephones of thousands of consumers.

He graduated *magna cum laude* from the John Marshall Law School in May 2010 and served as Managing Editor for the John Marshall Law Review. His student Comment, which examines bicycling and government tort immunity in Illinois, appears in Vol. 43, No. 1 of the John

Marshall Law Review. While in law school, John externed with Judge Thomas Hoffman at the Illinois Appellate Court, and competed in the ABA National Appellate Advocacy Competition.

John is active in the Illinois legal community, and serves as Co-Chair of the Membership Committee on the Young Professionals Board of Illinois Legal Aid Online (ILAO). ILAO is a non-profit organization committed to using technology to increase access to free and pro bono legal services for underserved communities throughout Illinois.

He received his B.A. with Honors in Political Science from the University of Iowa in 2004.

ROGER PERLSTADT is an Associate at EDELSON PC, where he concentrates on appellate and complex litigation advocacy. Roger graduated from the University of Chicago Law School, where he was a member of the University of Chicago Law Review. After law school, he served as a clerk to the Honorable Elaine E. Bucklo of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Prior to joining the firm, Roger spent several years at a litigation boutique in Chicago where his practice included employment and housing discrimination claims, constitutional litigation, and general commercial matters. In 2011, he was named a Rising Star by Illinois Super Lawyers Magazine.

Roger also spent time as a Visiting Assistant Professor at the University of Florida Law School where he taught Arbitration, Conflict of Laws, and Employment Discrimination, and has published articles on the Federal Arbitration Act in various law reviews.

EVE-LYNN RAPP is an Associate at EDELSON PC. Eve-Lynn focuses her practice in the areas of consumer and technology class action litigation.

Prior to joining EDELSON PC, Eve-Lynn was involved in numerous class action cases in the areas of consumer and securities fraud, debt collection abuses and public interest litigation. Eve-Lynn has substantial experience in both state and federal courts, including successfully briefing issues in both the United States and Illinois Supreme Courts.

Eve-Lynn received her J.D. from Loyola University of Chicago-School of Law, graduating cum laude, with a Certificate in Trial Advocacy. During law school, Eve-Lynn was an Associate Editor of Loyola's International Law Review and externed as a "711" at both the Cook County State's Attorney's Office and for Cook County Commissioner Larry Suffredin. Eve-Lynn also clerked for both civil and criminal judges (Honorable Yvonne Lewis and Plummer Lott) in the Supreme Court of New York.

Eve-Lynn graduated from the University of Colorado, Boulder, with distinction and Phi Beta Kappa honors, receiving a B.A. in Political Science.

BEN THOMASSEN is an Associate at EDELSON PC. At the firm, Ben's practice centers on the prosecution of class actions cases that address federally protected privacy rights and issues of consumer fraud—several of which have established industry-changing precedent. Among other high profile cases, Ben recently played key roles in delivering the winning oral argument before the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit in *Curry v. AvMed*, 693 F.3d 1317

(11th Cir. 2012) (a data breach case that has, following the Eleventh Circuit's decision, garnered national attention both within and without the legal profession) and securing certification of a massive consumer class in *Dunstan v. comScore*, No. 11 C 5807, 2013 WL 1339262 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 2, 2013) (estimated by several sources as the largest privacy case ever certified on an adversarial basis).

Ben received his J.D., *magna cum laude*, from Chicago-Kent College of Law, where he also earned his certificate in Litigation and Alternative Dispute Resolution and was named Order of the Coif. At Chicago-Kent, Ben was Vice President of the Moot Court Honor Society and earned (a currently unbroken firm record of) seven CALI awards for receiving the highest grade in Appellate Advocacy, Business Organizations, Conflict of Laws, Family Law, Personal Income Tax, Property, and Torts.

Before settling into his legal career, Ben worked in and around the Chicago and Washington, D.C. areas in a number of capacities, including stints as a website designer/developer, a regular contributor to a monthly Capitol Hill newspaper, and a film projectionist and media technician (with many years experience) for commercial theatres, museums, and educational institutions. Ben received his Bachelor of Arts, *summa cum laude*, from St. Mary's College of Maryland and his Master of Arts from the University of Chicago.

JACK YAMIN is an Associate at EDELSON PC, where he focuses on privacy and consumer class actions.

Jack graduated cum laude from Northwestern University's Accelerated (2-year) JD Program. While in law school, Jack was a member of the Center for Wrongful Convictions, where he worked on post-conviction cases in Illinois appellate courts. Jack also served as a judicial extern to the Honorable Marvin Aspen, a senior judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Throughout law school, Jack was a member of the Center for Conflict Resolution, where he mediated cases in Illinois courts throughout Chicago.

Prior to joining the firm, Jack worked as a tax consultant for business owners throughout the country, representing clients before the Internal Revenue Service, negotiating installment agreements, and handling tax audits. Jack also spent some time working at a literary agency, helping writers publish novels and marketing their work. Jack graduated *summa cum laude* from Binghamton University, earning his B.A. in philosophy and English literature. He is a member of the Phi Beta Kappa honor society.